REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 94-111 remain pending in the application. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 94, 99, 103 and 108 are amended. No new matter is added.

On pages 3-5 of the Office Action, claims 94-111 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,029,141 (Bezos et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As exemplified in Fig. 3, Applicants have disclosed an exemplary block diagram. For example, in block 100, a vendor sets up a new custom store using an application. This causes a database in a server system 101 to be changed. An administration URL is provided to an external administrator in step 102. In step 104, the external administrator uses the URL to go to an administration page created by the server system 101 (e.g., page 9, lines 1-4). The administrative page preferably includes a log-in system to authenticate the external administrator (e.g., page 9, lines 4-5).

Applicants have further disclosed that a user goes to a secure page run by the external organization or group in step 108 (e.g., page 9, lines 10 and 11). The user can select and go to the custom store page in step 110. In step 110, the correct custom web page is created. In step 112, the user selects the products or virtual bundles and purchases them from the custom store (e.g., page 9, lines 11-14).

Applicants have further disclosed step 114 in which the reconciliation application checks the custom stores for obsolete product listings (e.g., page 9, lines 17 and 18). A notification E-mail sent to the administrator in step 116 and the

administrator can modify the selections and virtual bundles to remove obsolete products from the custom store (e.g., page 9, lines 18-20).

Applicants have argued of record that the Bezos patent is directed to a different type of electronic commerce site than that represented in the currently pending claims. For example, the Bezos patent discloses an associate program, that enables an associate to refer a customer, who visits the associate's web site, on to a merchant for a sale. As disclosed in the Bezos patent, when a customer purchases a product as a result of that referral, the associate is given a commission or some other form of compensation. As previously argued of record, the Bezos et al. patent is directed to a customer accessing a site of an associate, and being referred to a merchant's site to complete the sale of a product the customer viewed at the associate's site.

However, Applicants' claims are directed to a customized store that can be set up at the vendor's web site itself. Specifically, Applicants have disclosed, an administrator can designate a selected set of products of the vendor, and/or specialized pricing for the vendor's products, that are to appear in the customized store. For example, a school administrator might set up a limited number of computers that are specifically configured to comply with various curricula at the school. Thereafter, when a customer accesses the *vendor's* site, that customer is presented with the customized store that displays the set of products and/or prices designated by the administrator.

At least for the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Bezos et al. patent does not anticipate the subject matter of the pending claims. The Bezos et al. patent would not have taught or suggested "an administrative

application that executes on a computer to provide an administrator with an administration interface to view said information relating to said products and to store in said database configuration data that defines a custom store having at least one of a restricted set of said products and non-standard pricing for said products; ... wherein said administration interface is secured for administration, but not for customer access," as recited in independent claim 94, and as variously recited in claims 99, 103 and 108.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Bezos et al. patent would not have taught or suggested, " a custom store application that executes on a computer and that examines a referrer header field in an HTTP request from a customer for access to said electronic commerce site to determine whether said referrer field indicates that said customer request originated from a predetermined host and, if the referrer field indicates that the request originated from said predetermined host, generates and causes to be displayed a custom store page from said vendor's electronic commerce site that contains the restricted set of said products and/or the non-standard pricing for said products defined by configuration data associated with said predetermined host, wherein said administration interface is secured for administration, but not for customer access," as recited in claim 94.

The Office Action states that claim 99 is "rejected on the same grounds as claim 94." However, as explicitly pointed out in Applicants' previous response, claims 99-102 and 108-111 are directed to a different aspect of the invention, namely a reconciliation feature that identifies and notifies the administrator of obsolete products (see the Amendment filed October 22, 2007, at page 12). The response further pointed out why this feature is not found in the Bezos et al. patent. The Office

Action ignores this difference between the claims, and fails to address the Applicants' arguments and identify where the noted features can be found in the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the Bezos et al. patent would not have taught or suggested, "a custom store application that executes on a computer and that is responsive to a request for customer access to said electronic commerce site that designates a custom store, for generating and causing to be displayed a custom store page from said vendor's electronic commerce site that contains the restricted set of said products and/or the non-standard pricing for said products defined by said configuration data, wherein said administration interface is secured for administration, but not for customer access; and a reconciliation application that determines whether said configuration data includes information relating to products that are no longer available from said vendor, and provides notification to the administrator if such information is included in the configuration data," as recited in claim 99.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Bezos et al. patent would not have taught or suggested, "in response to an HTTP request for customer access to said electronic commerce site, determining whether a referrer header field of said request indicates that said request originated from a predetermined host and, if the referrer field indicates that the request originated from said predetermined host, generating and causing to be displayed a custom store page from said vendor's electronic commerce site that contains the restricted set of said products and/or the non-standard pricing for said products defined by configuration data associated with said predetermined host, wherein said computer interface is secured for administration, but not for customer access," as recited in claim 103.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Bezos et al. patent would not have taught or suggested, " in response to a request for customer access to said electronic commerce site, determining whether said request designates a custom store, and generating and causing to be displayed a custom store page from said vendor's electronic commerce site that contains the restricted set of said products and/or the non-standard pricing for said products defined by said configuration data; and determining whether said configuration data includes information relating to products that are no longer offered by said vendor, and providing notification via said interface if such information is included in the configuration data, wherein said interface is secured for administration, but not for customer access," as recited in claim 108.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants' claims 94, 99, 103 and 108 are allowable. The remaining dependent claims recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

For at least these reasons, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that all

pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited prior art. Reconsideration and

withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 12, 2008   By: _____

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620